1	MR. PRICE: Why don't you read
2	BY MR. SHOOK:
3	Q You could read the EB 1 first because that
4	came first in time.
5	A Okay. Okay.
6	Q Are the sentences that appear as the final
7	sentence of your response to request for deletion 7
8	accurate?
9	A No. That's not accurate because it gives
10	the impression that the that there was an ongoing -
11	- there was an ongoing activity to determine what was
12	in the Public Inspection File right after the
13	conversation of Mr. Evans.
14	Q Then to make it accurate it should read
15	how?
16	A It should otherwise read, Mr. Ramirez
17	endeavored on an ongoing basis as a result of
18	completing the license renewal application to
19	determine what was in the KALW Public Inspection File
20	and what needed to be added to that file in order to
21	ensure that it was complete.
22	Q Thank you. In 2001, so we're now jumping

1	three years, did you ever become aware that SFUSD or
2	its counsel had received a letter from the FCC which
3	inquired among other things about certain aspects of
4	the KALW Public Inspection File at the time of the
5	filing of the 1997 renewal application?
6	A No.
7	Q So in 2001 you never received did you
8	ever receive a question from anyone connected with
9	SFUSD about the condition of the Public Inspection
10	File of 1997?
11	A No.
12	Q Did you ever speak with Nicole Sawaya
13	about these December 10, 1997 signature dates with the
14	'93 and '95 supplemental ownership reports?
15	A No.
16	Q Nicole Sawaya never asked you about the
17	what issues programs list existed at the time in
18	the public file at the time that the '97 renewal
19	application was filed?
20	A No.
21	Q I think we talked about this a little
22	earlier. After you had left KALW but before the

1	Nicole Sawaya became KALW's general manager in
2	March of 2001, you had contact with her, correct?
3	A Yes. I mean to the best of my memory we
4	would have stayed in contact personally, yes.
5	Q Now according to Ms. Sawaya, and her
6	testimony is evidence in this proceeding as SFUSD
7	Exhibit T3, she testified that your paths have crossed
8	many times since your involvement with the Next
9	Generation project ended. Would that correspond with
10	your memory?
11	A Yes.
12	Q Can you give us a rough guess as to how
13	many, or an estimate as to how many times your paths
14	have crossed?
15	A We'd have the opportunity to run into each
16	other at annual industry conferences. There might be
17	two or three a year that we would both attend because
18	our respective organizations would have sent us.
19	There would have been regional meetings
20	that I would have attended through my job at CPB that
21	she would have attended. For instance, the Annual
22	California Public Radio meeting I had gone to on

Τ	occasion as assigned.
2	On taking a vacation break I'd go back to
3	San Francisco quite often to relax and we would meet.
4	Those would be the kind of occasions when we would
5	cross paths.
6	Q Since she's become general manager of KALW
7	have you continued to have contact with her?
8	A Yes. We I'd estimate we would probably
9	talk by telephone once or twice a year to say hello
10	and catch up on personal things.
11	Q While you were still at KALW, so this
12	timeframe now is back August '96 through January of
13	'98, did you ever tell her about problems with the
14	station staff?
15	A I don't remember.
16	Q After you left KALW, did you ever tell her
17	about problems with station staff?
18	A I don't remember.
19	Q After you left KALW did you ever tell her
20	that there had been problems with the station's public
21	inspection file?
22	A I don't remember.

1	Q Did you ever tell her about a license
2	challenge?
3	A I don't remember.
4	Q Did you ever tell her about Golden Gate
5	Public Radio?
6	A I don't remember.
7	Q Did you ever talk to her about why you
8	left KALW?
9	A I don't remember anything specific.
10	Q Well let me put this into some context.
11	We had talked about how difficult the job was for you
12	and you related that you put on a fair amount of
13	weight and that the job was difficult. I think I may
14	have characterized it and I think you agreed that the
15	job was killing you and so you decided to leave.
16	Now Nicole's a friend of yours and she's
17	about to become the general manager of KALW, didn't
18	you tell her what was going on that caused you to
19	leave?
20	A Again, I don't remember anything specific
21	that I told her about that. No, I don't remember
22	anything specific.

1.	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well maybe the question
2	could be answered in a general way though. In
3	general, did you have a conversation with her about
4	the station, how it was going? In general?
5	THE WITNESS: Yes. In general it would
6	have been in the context of us in a personal way
7	talking about work. It's tough to manage any public
8	radio station. Okay. Public stations don't have the
9	luxury of selling commercials to generate revenue.
10	Public radio is the kind of business, we
11	send our programming out for free and then we ask
12	listeners, people consuming our service to then send
13	us money. I mean, that's kind of a backward business
14	plan there, it makes it tough to operate any public
15	radio station.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: She already knows that,
17	right? I mean from her experience she already knows
18	that?
19	THE WITNESS: Yes. Yes.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: But I'm saying that as
21	in general in a general way, didn't you give her
22	some insights into what your views were about the

1	station as you were leaving it?
2	THE WITNESS: Again, I don't remember
3	anything specific. Both Nicole and I just both had
4	awareness that managing a public radio station in San
5	Francisco was quite a challenge.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right.
7	THE WITNESS: It's a tough market.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. You've answered
9	that. Okay. Mr. Shook?
10	BY MR. SHOOK:
11	Q Mr. Ramirez I want to refer you to
12	Enforcement Bureau Exhibit 42.
13	A Okay.
14	Q Is this a document that you've seen before
15	today?
16	A Let me go through the whole document.
17	Q Take your time. Mr. Ramirez, had you seen
18	this document before today?
19	A No, I've never seen this before.
20	Q Moving on to page 5 of the document, do
21	you recall being asked by anyone about information in
22	respect to request number 5?

1	A Okay. What's the question?
2	Q Did anybody ever ask you to try to respond
3	to that question to try to give them an idea of what
4	documents you might have relied on?
5	MR. PRICE: Objection, Your Honor. I'm
6	going to caution the witness not to disclose any
7	conversations he may have had with present counsel.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Certainly not the substance
9	of the conversation, but you can get at it, I think.
10	MR. SHOOK: I can get at it another way.
11	BY MR. SHOOK:
12	Q Mr. Ramirez, take a look at Enforcement
13	Bureau Exhibit number 43. You'll see that it's
14	entitled San Francisco Unified School Districts'
15	Objections and Responses to Enforcement Bureau's First
16	Request for Production of Documents.
17	If you move to if you go to page 5
18	there is request number 5 and then there's an answer.
19	If you could just review those to yourself and then
20	I'll ask a question.
21	A Okay.
22	Q Now I'm not interested in the first two

1

1.	sentences that deal with the objections, pretty
2	confident you didn't have anything to do with that.
3	But in terms of the remainder of the response the
4	remainder of the answer, which begins with subject 2
5	and without waiving the foregoing objections or
6	general objections.
7	SFUSD states that upon information and
8	believe Mr. Ramirez would have considered the issues
9	programs list and ownership reports from the stations
10	Public Inspection File in connection with answering
11	item 2 at page 3 of SFUSD's application.
12	Those documents can be located on the CD
13	produced by SFUSD to the bureau and are denominated
14	KALW 0001 through 1008 (issues programs list) except
15	that Mr. Ramirez would not have relied upon any such
16	documents on the CD that relate to later time periods
17	or that were created after August 1, 1997.
18	Such as the document entitled City Visions
19	Quarterly Issues Programs List 1992 through 1997
20	CEGKALW000107, which upon information and belief was
21	generated and placed in the file after August 1, 1997.

Mr. Ramirez

Furthermore,

22

have

would

1	considered the 1997 ownership report that was attached
2	to the application. SFUSD further states that
3	Mr. Ramirez consulted relevant sections of a National
4	Federation of Community Broadcasters Legal Handbook in
5	completing the application.
6	The excerpt to that document is produced
7	herewith and has been labeled SFUSD0001, SFUSD00082.
8	Were you the source of any of the information that I
9	just read?
10	MR. PRICE: Objection.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: No. I'm going to overrule
12	that objection.
13	MR. PRICE: Be he doesn't know what all
14	this he doesn't know what of this he was the
15	source.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: You can answer the
17	question. He can answer the question. Might not be
18	the answer that he wants, but he can answer the
19	question.
20	THE WITNESS: Yes.
21	BY MR. SHOOK:
22	Q What information did you provide?

1.	A The information relating to the
2	information that the Issues Program List and the
3	ownership reports that are mentioned here and on the
4	next page with respect to the 1997 ownership report
5	and in the next sentence with respect to the National
6	Federation of Community Broadcasters Legal Handbook in
7	completing the application.
8	Q So in terms of the issues programs list,
9	am I to understand from your answer that there were a
10	series of documents that you looked at in connection
11	with the response or the answer that was given by
12	SFUSD to the bureau?
13	A I'm not sure if I understand the question.
14	Q I'm trying to figure out what documents,
15	if any, you looked at in connection with providing
16	information that appears as the answer that we're
17	that we've just looked at on pages 5 and 6 of EB
18	Exhibit 43.
19	MR. PRICE: Can I just ask to clarify what
20	you're talking about whether he looked at them in
21	2004, whether he looked at them in 1997?
22	MR. SHOOK: Well, we find out when he

looked at them, I don't know.

THE WITNESS: Well I think I know what you're asking me. I think the list that I think this relates to is what we referred to as Exhibit O, but which I think was a seven page document versus the five to seven page document.

BY MR. SHOOK:

Q All right. Well the reason that I'm a little bit puzzled is that the SFUSD states that upon information and belief Mr. Ramirez would have considered the issues programs list and ownership reports from the station's Public Inspection File in connection with answering item 2 at page 3 of SFUSD's application.

Those documents can be located on the CD produced by SFUSD to the Bureau and are denominated and then it has a set of numbers there, which suggest that we're looking -- we're talking about a thousand pages worth of material.

A Then I must just be misunderstanding your question. Well what I think this is saying is that what did I rely on to respond to questions number 2

1	and 3.
2	Q Right. In responding to the Bureau's
3	document request, we're trying to find out how it was
4	that this answer came to be and if you had a role in
5	it, what role that might have been.
6	A I'm sorry. I'm confused.
7	Q Okay. It's now 2004.
8	A Okay.
9	Q You're being asked by someone to try to
10	provide information about what it was that you were
11	looking at in determining and certifying to the
12	accuracy of the yes answer given by SFUSD to the
13	section 3, question 2 that we have been talking about
14	at length, which is the public file question.
15	A Okay.
16	Q So we're the Bureau is trying to find
17	out at this stage what documents were you looking at
18	in order to make that certification and here's the
19	answer that we're getting. What I'm trying to find
20	out is what role, if any, you played in preparing this
21	answer.

sorry. I don't

Α

Ι′m

22

know how to

1	characterize the role that I played, if I played any
2	at all.
3	Q Okay. Well maybe I misunderstood what I
4	thought you said before, but I thought you said that
5	there were there was information that you provided
6	in order to be able to respond to this question. I
7	just want to try to find out what information was you
8	provided?
9	A I'm sorry. I'm just not following along.
10	Q To give you some idea of where I'm coming
11	from, what I'm reading here tells me that you relied,
12	perhaps on hundreds of pages of documents in order to
13	make the certification that you did.
14	We're asking SFUSD to produce all
15	documents relied upon by you in determining and
16	certifying to the accuracy of the yes answer that you
17	gave to the renewal application question, section 3,
18	question 2.
19	A Okay.
20	Q The answer that we're getting here is that
21	there were hundreds of pages of documents that you had
22	relied on.

1	MR. PRICE: Objection. I think that
2	mischaracterizes the answer. I think that maybe the
3	source of Mr. Ramirez' confusion. I mean, it
4	identifies that the documents he relied upon are
5	contained within the disk that contains a thousand
6	documents and then excludes all the documents that
7	would have come after a certain period of time.
8	So the resulting number of documents on
9	that disk that Mr. Ramirez may have relied on could
10	have been a few as five or it could have been as many
11	as a hundred. But I think he's being confused by the
12	characterization of that we've answered that he
13	reviewed hundreds of documents. So I'm not sure
14	that's what the answer here says.
15	BY MR. SHOOK:
16	Q Okay. So really it's not the documents
17	are not denominated 1 through 1008 that were actually
18	relied upon by Mr. Ramirez, but it's only a few
19	documents, is that it?
20	A Yes.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: This is also an answer
22	that's based upon information of belief, Mr. Ramirez

	is a long time removed from the company.
2	MR. SHOOK: Right. He may only be one
3	part of this. There may be other people who
4	contributed to it and I'm just trying to determine
5	what Mr. Ramirez' contribution is to this answer.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well that's a it's a
7	clear question then there. Do you have any do you
8	have knowledge or what knowledge do you have with
9	respect to how this answer would fit together and
10	since it refers to you?
11	THE WITNESS: I don't remember.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Now this is 2004.
13	THE WITNESS: Yes.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's not really asking a
15	lot to remember 2004 what you know about what do you
16	know about how this answer was constructed? How was
17	it put together since it relates to you? It wasn't
18	that long ago.
19	THE WITNESS: I guess what I'm confused
20	about is I don't remember writing this.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: No, I'm not asking you what
22	you wrote.

1	THE WITNESS: Okay.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: I don't I'm just asking
3	you what do you know this is going back in, again,
4	September 2004, we are in June of 2005, going back to
5	that period of time, what information can you give us
б	in terms of how that answer was put together? What
7	was being in terms of
8	THE WITNESS: I think I know what you're
9	asking.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: your participation. Did
11	somebody come to you and say we need information; we
12	need help from you on this?
13	THE WITNESS: Yes. I think I know what
14	you're asking. I think that I was sent a number of
15	documents to look at and then the documents that I
16	said were the ones that were the ones that were needed
17	were the issues program was and the ownership
18	reports.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. All right. Do you
20	have anything more to follow on that?
21	MR. SHOOK: No.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. That's all you

	141011.
2	THE WITNESS: Yes. That's all I think I
3	know if I understand what this says.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well it seems to be pretty
5	straight forward. It wants to know what, with respect
6	to your answer; it wants to know what you consider in
7	the answer going back to specific questions
8	THE WITNESS: The way I read this is
9	someone sent me, say for example, ten documents, asked
10	me to identify the ones that I would have used with
11	respect to completing the license renewal application.
12	I said documents two and document five.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Is that your recollection?
14	THE WITNESS: Yes.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: You actually received
16	documents that were shipped to you in the mail and
17	then you identified which ones were the ones that you
18	relied upon?
19	THE WITNESS: I remember reviewing
20	documents online, I remember reviewing documents in
21	person, which was a part of a process to identify
22	documents that looked familiar to me and related to

1	one thing or another.
2	MR. SHOOK: When you say online
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Were you given a CD to use
4	and then on that CD there were documents that you
5	could look at one by one by one on the CD and decide,
6	yes that was there or no that wasn't there?
7	THE WITNESS: No, I was never given a CD.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: So you were given a stack
9	of documents?
10	THE WITNESS: I can remember looking
11	through a for lack of a better stack of
12	documents, yes.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Which consisted of what?
14	THE WITNESS: Which would have consisted
15	of the Issues Program List here that I identify as the
16	one in connection with answering the renewal
17	application and the ownership report that I used in
18	connection with completing the renewal application.
19	BY MR. SHOOK:
20	Q Okay. So that issues programs list was
21	what, three pages I think, we've gone over again and
22	again and again, the City Visions program program's

1	list was three pages in length.
2	MR. PRICE: Objection. I think he
3	identified the document was seven pages, but that
4	Exhibit O was only pages 5 through 7.
5	MR. SHOOK: Three pages.
6	MR. PRICE: I think he needs I think he
7	can testify that he may have not looked at the entire
8	document at some point.
9	MR. SHOOK: In connection with this
10	response, we're just trying to figure out what he
11	looked at.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Can you tell us?
13	THE WITNESS: Yes. I think what I
14	identified was what has become known as Exhibit O and
15	the ownership report is the 1997 ownership report that
16	I attached to the renewal application.
17	BY MR. SHOOK:
18	Q That was it?
19	A Yes. That's what I believe these two
20	items are.
21	MR. PRICE: Your Honor, I think
22	Mr. Ramirez might be confused because I think he's

1 trying to answer the question what documents reviewed specifically just to answer this question and 2 3 I don't think he's privy to that -- I don't think he 4 was privy to that information. 5 I think he could be -- I think he could 6 answer questions about in late 19 -- in late 2004 7 being showed on several occasions a series of 8 documents. He may be able to testify to that process 9 receiving some by email and looking at some in person 10 in advance of his deposition. 11 I think he's struggling with what review 12 lead to these specific answers of those several 13 reviews and I think he's struggling with that. 14 don't know if that -- I don't know if there's an 15 easier way -- fair way to ask those questions. Well, I don't know. JUDGE SIPPEL: 16 17 another way to muddy the waters. This is -- the 18 questions seems to be pretty straight forward and it's not that far back that he couldn't remember and 19 20 because of the passage of time might not remember for

NEAL R. GROSS

other reasons, but not through the passage of time.

pretty significant

It's

а

21

22

piece

1	information to give the licensee to respond with. If
2	anybody had knowledge as to what he relied upon when
3	he answered yes to that question, what documents
4	he's listing them in here.
5	I think that you narrowed it down right to
6	that two pages that was in that I don't want to
7	misstate it now, but it was in the City Lights or
8	whatever the heck it was that
9	MR. SHOOK: City Visions.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: City Visions.
11	MR. PRICE: You're doing it too.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes. I'm inclined to leave
13	the record where it is. I don't know if you're going
14	to pursue this anymore with this witness and give him
15	anything clearer.
16	MR. SHOOK: I'm afraid we are where we
17	are.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Do you have another
19	line of questions?
20	MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, if we could have
21	a minute?
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Can you go off the record

for a minute few minutes?
(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went
off the record at 5:41 p.m. and resumed at 5:42 p.m.)
JUDGE SIPPEL: You're finished?
MR. SHOOK: We are.
JUDGE SIPPEL: With this witness?
MR. SHOOK: Yes, sir.
MR. PRICE: Your Honor, in the interest of
it's now ten to 6:00, I think I'm going to take
more than ten minutes to finish the redirect, so with
Your Honor's indulgence and I spoke briefly about this
before maybe, but we'll bring Mr. Ramirez back briefly
tomorrow morning and I will wrap up the redirect as
quickly as I can and we'll move on to Mr. Hegelson.
JUDGE SIPPEL: Do you think you can do it
in 30 minutes? I don't want to push you where you
don't want to go, but I mean
MR. PRICE: I'm not sure what your
JUDGE SIPPEL: Do you have a good idea as
to what kind of a timeframe it would take.
MR. PRICE: I think 30 minutes might be
kind of tight. I think in the interest of the witness

1	having been up here for a long time today it might be
2	better suited and be more inclined to go faster when
3	we start tomorrow morning.
4	MR. SHOOK: I'm fine with that.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Let's go off
6	the record.
7	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went
8	off the record at 5:43 p.m. and resumed at 5:45 p.m.)
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: We are completed today.
10	It's ten minutes of 6:00 and we will start tomorrow at
11	9:15 a.m. same place and same witness on the stand.
12	You're still under oath; you're under oath
13	until you're excused. Do you understand that?
14	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay.
16	MR. SHOOK: Would you also remind him
17	about sequestration?
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: You're in sequestration
19	which means that you can certainly speak with your
20	attorney in terms of your preparation, but you cannot
21	speak with any other witnesses in this case. Do you
22	understand that?

1	THE WITNESS: Yes, SIY.
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: The best thing to do is
3	just don't talk to anybody about this case until you
4	get off the stand except your attorney. Okay?
5	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. We're in recess
7	until 9:15. Thank you.
8	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter was
9	concluded at 5:46 p.m.)
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER, TRANSCRIBER, AND PROOFREADER

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Name of Hearing MB DOCKET NO. 04-191 Docket No. (if applicable) 445 12th STREET, S.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. Place of Hearing JUNE 6, 2005 Date of Hearing We, the undersigned, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, numbers 215 through 513 inclusive, are the true, accurate and complete transcript prepared from the reporting by Eric Stadnik (Reporter's Name) in attendance at the above identified hearing, in accordance with applicable provisions of the current Federal Communications Commission's professional verbatim reporting and transcription statement of Work and have verified the accuracy of the accuracy of the transcript by (1) comparing the typewritten transcript against the reporting or recording accomplished at the hearings and (2) comparing the final proofed typewritten transcript against the reporting or recording accomplished at the hearing or conference. June 20, 2005 Eric Stadnik Legible Name and Signature of Reporter Date Name of Company: Neal Gross Co. June 20, 2005 Elizabeth Carter

Legible Name and Signature of Transcriber

Legible Name and Signature of Proofreader

Name of Company: Neal Gross Co.

Name of Company: __Neal Gross Co.

Kevin Murphy

Date

Date

June 20, 2005